

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

11 SUNNY B. KEEM, 1:09-cv-2112-BAK-SMS (HC)  
12 Petitioner,  
13 vs.  
14 KEN CLARK,  
15 Respondent.

ORDER TRANSFERRING CASE TO THE  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR  
THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF  
CALIFORNIA

18 Petitioner, a state prisoner proceeding pro se, has filed a habeas corpus action pursuant to 28  
19 U.S.C. § 2254, together with a request to proceed in forma pauperis pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915.

20 The federal venue statute requires that a civil action, other than one based on diversity  
21 jurisdiction, be brought only in “(1) a judicial district where any defendant resides, if all defendants  
22 reside in the same state, (2) a judicial district in which a substantial part of the events or omissions  
23 giving rise to the claim occurred, or a substantial part of the property that is the subject of the action is  
24 situated, or (3) a judicial district in which any defendant may be found, if there is no district in which  
25 the action may otherwise be brought.” 28 U.S.C. § 1331(b).

26 In this case, the petitioner is challenging a conviction from Los Angeles County, which is in the  
27 Central District of California. Therefore, the petition should have been filed in the United States District  
28 Court for the Central District of California. In the interest of justice, a federal court may transfer a case

1 filed in the wrong district to the correct district. See 28 U.S.C. § 1406(a); Starnes v. McGuire, 512 F.2d  
2 918, 932 (D.C. Cir. 1974).

3 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that this matter is transferred to the United States  
4 District Court for the Central District of California.

5  
6 IT IS SO ORDERED.

7 **Dated: December 14, 2009**

8 /s/ Sandra M. Snyder  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE